

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1913

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS

Forty-one Branch Committees; 17,002* members in 354 cities, towns, and villages.

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,
Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building,
Boston.

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State.

MASSACHUSETTS REPUBLICANS ON SUFFRAGE

There seems to be a mistaken impression in some quarters that the Republican state convention in this state declared in favor of a suffrage amendment to the constitution, last October.

It did nothing of the kind. What it did do was to adopt the following:

"As seventeen years have passed since the question of woman's suffrage was submitted to the voters of the Commonwealth, we recommend that the Legislature consider the advisability of securing another expression of opinion on the subject."

What the convention recommended to the Legislature, therefore, was not the submission of a suffrage

amendment, but "an expression of opinion." The reference to the referendum of 1895 shows what the convention meant by "an expression of opinion." The suffragists at that time vehemently opposed the proposed referendum, and entreated the Governor to veto the bill authorizing it. Their reason for this course was that the bill provided for an expression of opinion by women as well as by men. There is nothing that the suffragists desire less than to have the opinion of women registered upon this question. In every state where this proceeding has been proposed, the suffragists have opposed it. Their fears were justified in 1895 when, after an energetic state-wide campaign they were able to poll less than 4 per cent of Massachusetts women of voting age in favor of suffrage. This also is why The Woman's Journal of October 12, 1912, denounced the Republican declaration as "ambiguous and a straddle."

It is clear that, if Republican members of the present Massachusetts Legislature feel themselves bound by the state platform, they are held to nothing more than the consideration of a referendum similar to that of 1895.

SHUNTING RESPONSIBILITY

Suffragists often entreat members of legislatures to shunt their responsibility in the matter of constitutional amendments upon the people.

It doesn't matter, say these suffragists to the legislators, whether you believe in woman suffrage or not. Give the people a chance to vote upon it. If you refuse to do this, you show that you do not trust the people.

Legislators who are assailed in this way would do well to keep in

mind what the constitutional restrictions mean. The framers of the Massachusetts Constitution, for example, did not intend that the instrument should be subject to any passing popular caprice or passion. They meant that when changes were made, it should be after discussion and deliberation. They put the first responsibility for changes upon the Legislature. If a proposed amendment did not receive the approval of a majority of the Senators and two-thirds of the members of the House of Representatives, that was the end of it, so far as that Legislature was concerned. But, if it was agreed to by the required number of Senators and Representatives, it must go before a second Legislature, and must again receive the approval of a majority of the Senators and two-thirds of the Representatives before being submitted to the people.

Any legislator, therefore, who, under suffrage pressure, should swallow his own convictions and vote for a suffrage amendment of which he did not approve, simply in order that the people might have a chance to vote on it, would, to that extent, nullify the safeguards of the Constitution.

THE REMONSTRANCE does not believe that Massachusetts legislators are made of that kind of stuff.

THE SUFFRAGE WATERLOO IN WISCONSIN

It may have been noticed that the suffrage newspapers and speakers have had very little to say about the vote on the suffrage amendment in Wisconsin. They have admitted the defeat of the proposition, but they have not dwelt upon the size of the vote. The official figures have not interested them. Here they are, as furnished The Remonstrance from

the office of the Secretary of State:

For the amendment	135,545
Against	227,024

Majority against 91,479

The reticence of the suffragists is easily explained, in view of these figures. They had professed confidence of victory in that state, up to the day of the election. Yet they were beaten by a majority even larger than that by which the voters of Ohio rejected the amendment in September.

And the reason? It suits some of the suffragists to say that they owe their defeat to the brewers. But, during the campaign, they gave the brewers every assurance that they had nothing to fear from woman suffrage; and the more candid of them now admit that the brewers dealt fairly with them.

The real reason is rather to be found in the sound common sense of the average voter, who saw that most of the women did not want the ballot and was unwilling to thrust it upon them.

GOVERNOR WILSON'S APATHY

At the meeting of the New Jersey Woman's Suffrage Association, held at Trenton two days after the Presidential election, the delegates made no attempt to conceal their indignation against the President-elect because of his refusal to declare himself upon the suffrage question.

Representatives from two suffrage clubs reported that they had written to Governor Wilson asking where he stood on the question, but had received no reply. A letter written to the Governor by the chairman of the program committee, asking him to give some recognition of the convention, also failed to elicit a reply. Mrs. Laddey, the president of the convention, evoked loud applause when she said, with reference to this action of the Governor: "What are you suffragists going to do about it?" But somehow, no one could think of an answer to the question.

THE LESSON OF IT

The real lesson of the vote in western states last year on suffrage amendments is not one of discouragement to anti-suffragists, but of incentive to harder work and a more perfect organization.

That Arizona, a new state which began its career by incorporating in its constitution the most radical ideas, including the recall of judges, should vote for woman suffrage, was not surprising. Nor was it very surprising, in a year of wide-spread political upheaval, that Kansas,—where women had been voting at municipal elections for twenty-five years—should vote for full woman suffrage. This does not prove that municipal suffrage for women had proved a success; but that its existence confused the issue and made organized opposition more difficult. As to Oregon, the anti-suffrage forces, though energetic in their opposition, had been weakened by the strain of repeated campaigns under the operation of the initiative-referendum; and, doubtless also the pressure of contiguous suffrage states had some effect.

But, taking into consideration the three middle western states in which the proposal was submitted, what made the difference between them? In Ohio, the proposed amendment was defeated by a majority of 87,455; and in Wisconsin by a majority of 91,479; while in Michigan the vote, although against the amendment, was so close that the result was for weeks in doubt. The main difference was that in Ohio and Wisconsin the anti-suffrage women were well organized and made an energetic and effective campaign. In Michigan, on the other hand, the suffrage amendment was rushed through the legislature at a special session, called for a different purpose, and it took the anti-suffrage women by surprise, and found them unorganized.

The plain lesson is that in every state which is now open to suffrage

attack, the women who are opposed to suffrage should hasten to organize and make their opposition known. It will not do to wait until the attack is actually made, and a suffrage bill is pending in a legislature or a suffrage amendment is before the people. The fact must be recognized that the suffragists have been long in the field, that they are well organized, and that they are generously financed. They admit having spent \$40,000, for instance, in the Ohio campaign, and probably their total outlay was much more.

This is the year in which the legislatures of most of the states will be in session. A strong and concerted attempt will be made to persuade them to favor suffrage measures. Everywhere, the motto for anti-suffrage women must be,—Organize! Organize! Anticipate the misguided courtesy of men who imagine that, in favoring suffrage, they are meeting the desires of women, by making it clear that the great majority of American women do not want the suffrage, but look upon it as a heavy and unnecessary burden. Women who organize and work resolutely in this spirit will find themselves supported by sane and sensible men, in and out of legislatures.

NOT ONE IN TWENTY

The attempt made by Illinois suffragists to get 100,000 signers to a petition that a proposition to grant equal suffrage to women under the public policy act be submitted to the voters of the state at the election last November, failed miserably, notwithstanding the fact that a dollar a hundred was offered for signatures.

If, in a great state like Illinois, with a million and a half voters, it proved impossible to persuade more than 70,000,—even with a money inducement for the canvas—to commit themselves to woman suffrage, what ground is there for the claim that public sentiment in that state is clamorous for the ballot for women?

THAT PURIFYING INFLUENCE

To the Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE:

In a recent number of THE REMONSTRANCE, Mrs. Horton Pope, a leading suffragist of Denver, is quoted as saying: "Whether woman will purify politics, uplift man, or stand for a higher moral tone is entirely beside the question."

It may, however, be difficult, with this very effective plea stricken from the list of arguments, to convince the American electorate that so great and radical a change as suffrage is at all necessary in order to secure rights to woman. Mrs. Pope, in lightly putting aside those services on which woman's importance as an individual so largely depends, seems scarcely to realize in what the true value of woman's influence consists, and adds one more testimony, if such were needed, to show how greatly the sense of responsibility toward the race has declined with the growth of "individualism."

In the beginning, suffragists claimed that a short cut to the elevation and purification of society had been found in the ballot. Now, since time has proved this promise false, they disclaim any responsibility whatever for social evils and frankly say they have no reform in view. But if women decline to perform their paramount and most valuable services to the race and through the race to the state in using their moral influence on child and man, on what equally strong plea can they rest their claim? The women who accept all their responsibility as women are those whose entry into public life, in their maturer years at least, might have been of hopeful augury.

But the suffragists themselves kick over the ladder on which they have thus far mounted. "It is all beside the question" exclaims Mrs. Pope, even at the moment that suffragists are explaining their defeat in Ohio by saying they were beaten by the organized forces of evil. To abandon this line of argument in Colorado, however, is perhaps necessary. The facts are too conspicuously contrary to support it.

Little by little we are arriving at the gist of the question and reducing the suffrage arguments to:—"I have no other but a woman's reason,—I think it so,—because I think it so."

Last winter Mrs. Ida Husted

Harper said that no intelligent suffragist now used the "Taxation without representation" argument, knowing the fallacy on which it is based. Mrs. Horton Pope and other Denver suffragists now further agree to abandon the "Purifying influence" plea, which is quite ineffective after twenty years of suffrage. The next argument to be routed will be that wages are raised by the ballot, and these three utterly mistaken obsessions are the sole substance of the suffrage agitation. When they go, what remains but the parrot cry: "Votes for Women?"

JUSTE MILIEU.

WHO IS TO GAIN BY IT?

This is a question which legislators who are besought to support suffrage measures may well ask themselves.

Who will gain if woman suffrage is adopted?

Will it be the women?

Let the legislator look around among the women of his acquaintance. Are not most of them already sufficiently busy? They have their children to rear, and their homes to care for. Or, if unmarried, many of them have the burden of self-support, and many have others dependent upon them. Married and unmarried alike, they have duties to the church, to society, to charitable and philanthropic movements, which they faithfully perform. Is it a kindness to them to add the burdens of government, to require them to attend caucuses and political conventions, to acquaint themselves with public questions and the careers of public men, to become familiar with the records of parties and candidates, to take part in elections, and to serve on juries?

For all these added burdens, where is the compensation? Will it come in increased wages for women who work? Every sane person knows that it is not the ballot, but supply and demand and other economic considerations that determine wages. Women's wages are no higher in suffrage states than in non-suffrage. In some instances, notably in Colo-

rado, for example, they are lower,—and this is admitted by suffragists. But will the gain to women through suffrage come in the shape of better laws for the protection of women and children? The comparison made elsewhere in this paper between the laws of Massachusetts and Colorado is a sufficient answer in the negative. Massachusetts women do not have the ballot, and they do not want it; but man-elected and man-organized and administered legislatures have given them better laws than are to be found in any suffrage state.

But will society and the state gain anything by woman suffrage? In order that they should do so, it must be shown that women would vote, on the average, not only *almost* as intelligently, as discriminatingly, as regularly and as unselfishly as men, but *more* intelligently, discriminatingly, regularly and unselfishly. Otherwise, there could be no gain. But what suffragist has even attempted to show this? There have been unsupported and hysterical claims of a "moral uplift" which was to come to pass through woman's vote; but in seasoned suffrage states like Colorado such claims are abandoned,—and necessarily so, in view of well-known facts—and suffragist leaders themselves insist that women ought not to be expected to be any better than men.

If then, neither woman nor the state is to gain by woman suffrage, what excuse is there for voting for it?

WHERE THE OPPOSITION COMES FROM

(From The Outlook, Nov. 2, 1912)

The chief opposition to woman suffrage does not come from the liquor interests. It does not come from the politicians. It does not come from men who hold to restricted ideas of woman's sphere. It comes from women who find themselves already bearing all the responsibilities they feel themselves able to bear.

ANOTHER SUFFRAGE DEFEAT IN ENGLAND

The suffragists have met with another defeat in the British House of Commons.

On the 5th of November, an amendment to the Irish Home Rule bill providing for woman suffrage was rejected by the overwhelming vote of 314 to 141. The suffragettes were so angered by this vote that they went out and began smashing shop windows in Bond street; and two of them were arrested.

But does window-smashing pay? In 1911, a suffrage bill passed its second reading by a vote of 255 to 88. March 28, 1912, a few days after the promiscuous window-smashing crusade in London, a similar bill was defeated by a vote of 222 to 208. Here is a change from a favorable majority of 167 to an adverse majority of 14. And now the adverse majority is increased from 14 to 173. Evidently, the suffrage cause is moving in England, but it is moving backwards.

TEMPERANCE AND SUFFRAGE

Dr. Clarence True Wilson, the temperance speaker who, in a statement quoted in the last number of *THE REMONSTRANCE*, declared that no state had adopted woman's suffrage without setting back the temperance cause for twenty-five years, has been vehemently attacked by the *Woman's Journal* and by suffrage speakers. Yet the fact that none of the suffrage states have voted for prohibition, and that Colorado has just rejected it, goes far to prove his statement.

When it suits their purpose, the suffragists profess a zeal for temperance, and promise more drastic legislation as a result of woman suffrage; and regularly, when they are beaten, in a legislature or at the polls, they charge their defeat to the liquor interests. But, again, when it suits their purpose, they are not above coquetting with the brewers.

Ida Husted Harper, in the Spring-

field Union for Nov. 10, 1912, said: "In not one of the woman suffrage states is there a prohibitory law. One has just been defeated in Colorado, and while there is no proof that this was due to the women, it is probable that, if a majority had added their votes to those of the men who voted for it, it would have carried." In the *Milwaukee Free-Press* of October 20, 1912, May Wright Sewall wrote: "Votes for women will no more prohibit drink than they will prohibit food." The Wisconsin brewers seem to have been reassured by these and similar declarations by suffrage campaigners, for Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, campaign manager for the Political Equality League of Wisconsin, said, in a statement in the *Milwaukee Wisconsin* for Nov. 6, 1912: "The brewers in Wisconsin gave us, so far as we know, a perfectly square deal. They said at the beginning that they were not going to fight woman suffrage and so far as we know, they held to that decision."

In view of such declarations by the authorized leaders of the movement, how long can the suffragists hold the support of prohibitionists and the Women's Christian Temperance Union under the pretence that giving votes to women will promote temperance legislation?

WHERE ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS STAND

A familiar argument for suffrage is the statement that, however small may be the number of women who want to vote, they should be allowed to do so; and that it is selfish for women who do not want to vote to oppose them. The women who do not want to vote will not have to, it is argued, if women are given the ballot: why should they stand in the way of women who do want to vote?

The *Cleveland Leader* used this argument during the suffrage campaign in Ohio, and it was so effectively answered by Lucy J. Price, Secretary of the Cleveland Association

Opposed to Woman Suffrage, that *The Remonstrance* is impelled to quote the following passage from her letter:

"This is the most commonly heard of all the suffrage arguments and the most superficial.

Its great fallacy lies in the assumption that the stand of the 'antis' is that we do not want to vote. This is not our stand. If it were, the suffragists would be justified possibly in saying that we were selfish in the matter. Our stand is that we do not want the women of Ohio given the ballot. There is an immense difference between these two positions. One is personal and selfish. The other means that we believe it is the best thing for the state, for the country and for woman that she shall not be enfranchised, that such a franchise would work to positive disadvantage.

If we believe it will tend to make woman unwomanly and politics only more befuddled, with no good results, you may argue that we are mistaken. You cannot argue that such an opinion, held by a majority of the women of the state, has not a right to rule in a democracy where the majority is supposed to rule."

What is true in Ohio is equally true in Massachusetts.

NOT A SIROCCO

(Mrs. William Lowell Putnam in *The Boston Herald*, Nov. 9, 1912)

The decided defeat given the suffrage cause in Wisconsin in spite of Miss Addams's stumping of the state in its advocacy, shows that this movement is not one of those siroccos, which by blinding people with the dust they raise, carry everything before them.

It is because those opposed to the granting of further suffrage to women feel so strongly women's value to the community—believing that women have work to do of which men are incapable; because they believe that progress can only lie in guiding nature in the direction in which she is moving, and not in trying to head her off; because in short, they have an unconquerable prejudice in favor of progressing forward rather than backward, that they deplore the implication that the present wave of reaction will spread far before it is spent. They have more confidence in that divine attribute, common sense.

THE SUFFRAGISTS' MISTAKE

To the Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE:

In the Woman's Suffrage Movement, some women are undoubtedly struggling to obtain the means to accomplish a noble end. They hope to achieve conditions of life wherein Woman and future generations may develop towards the highest possibilities of the human race.

The Woman-Suffragist, of the best type, believes that civilization has reached a point at which the vote in the hands of Woman can right existing wrongs. The anti-suffragist knows that the franchise once given will never be withdrawn. The anti-suffragist fears the result of placing the vote in Woman's hands and doubts the beneficial effects of this interposition on her part.

To obtain the best conditions for right development in this world, it is necessary to work in accord with Nature or the Divine plan, call it what you choose. Man and Woman were created male and female for different purposes. Woman, except in rare cases which prove the rule, never fills Man's place or uses Man's tools or weapons, with equal efficiency. When she endeavors to fill Man's place, she misuses and wastes her natural powers and strength. Tools and weapons in inadequate hands become instruments of danger to the user and the public alike. Hitherto the vote has been a tool or weapon in the hands of Man. Can Woman, made for different purposes physically and, except in rare cases, differently endowed mentally, so use this tool or weapon as to benefit herself and future generations? Undoubtedly exceptional women could, but the exception is not the rule.

Woman was intended by Nature to be a potent factor in the creation of conditions wherein Man may develop towards his best possibilities. This, in order that he may, in his turn, create like conditions for Woman. Nothing in nature develops to its best independently. From the beginning Man and Woman have been the complement of each other. Their life has ever been one of mutual assistance and mutual dependence. The desire and capacity for the protection and best development of Woman is inherent in Man at his best: Note, at his best. If Woman endeavors to develop along lines contrary to Nature's plan and

if she arrays herself against Man, she is in grave danger of thwarting his best development. The Woman-Suffragist of the highest type believes that she intends to work in harmony with Man when she possesses the vote in common with him. The Anti-Suffragist fears that the spirit of restlessness, of conceited superiority and antagonism to Man, noticeable in many women to-day, will be increased rather than diminished by the franchise.

The complexities of modern civilization have forced many women into cramping, thwarting conditions of life. From the beginning of creation, they have been forced into such conditions by Man at his worst. The Anti-Suffragist contends that the chances of those women for betterment will not be increased by obtaining one of Man's tools or weapons. They will be unable to use it with equal efficiency. They will not live and work along the lines indicated by Nature. Above all, for their own disadvantage, they will run the risk of thwarting the best development of Man. They will be in danger of destroying his inborn sense of responsibility for the protection and development of the best in Woman.

Woman, living and working against Nature, opposing Man and misusing her natural strength and powers, is a mischievous and dangerous factor in human society. Woman, recognizing her correct position in Nature's plan and using the tools and weapons which Nature intended for her use, is Man's equal at his best, his superior and uplifter when he falls below his best. Standing in this position and honestly using her energies of body, mind and soul as Nature intended them to be used, she is capable of creating conditions in which Man may develop towards his best possibilities. Man, in his turn, will then create conditions in which Woman, the Child and future generations may grow, develop and achieve the highest.

Evil has been fought, in all times, by the best men of the world born of, influenced and helped by, the best women unaided by the franchise. Wrong after wrong has been righted by them, evil upon evil redressed. The Anti-Suffragist denies the present necessity for the changing of this order. The Anti-Suffragist believes that its continuance in the future will ensure the best development of the human race.

A movement among women for the creation of better conditions for the best development of Woman is undoubtedly needed in many directions. It must come through the slow, sure processes of education,—education, the world over, by organized effort, by precept and example, of their daughters, sisters and neighbors, by the women of broad unprejudiced outlook on life, capable of recognizing their true powers, opportunities and position in Nature's scheme.

JANE DEXTER.

"THE PRETTIER THE BETTER"

Commenting upon the use of pretty girls to sell suffrage papers in theatre foyers, and the recent letter of a prominent suffragist saying: "We would like to have several girls, the more the merrier and the prettier the better," Mary Boyle O'Reilly, writing in the Chicago Journal, very justly says:

Of all mistaken methods the deliberate misuse of pretty newsgirls is the worst, a frankly grotesque feature in a reform campaign, probably prophetic of developments to follow. Responsibility of great gravity rests on the feminine jingoes whose cynical carelessness of conventions threatens to degenerate into dangerous disregard of the proprieties.

It is a matter of common knowledge that women who live in great cities can not afford to take chances. Right minded women have no desire to do so. This fact must be known to suffrage leaders. Normal women enjoy by birthright an instinct for protecting which does the mothering work of the world.

There are in every city hundreds, even thousands, of young, pretty, lonely and socially unprotected girls enthusiastic to become identified with any new movement promising independence and excitement. No consensus of feminine voices explains the need of exposing girls to impertinence or worse. It is a deep and irremediable mistake not to guard girlhood from the mere appearance of evil.

Obvious harm may not immediately result to youthful advocates of suffrage out for "a lark," but no weak defense of an open fallacy can palliate the deplorable reaction of such casual carelessness on less fortunate girls who must habitually live unguarded.

MASSACHUSETTS VS. COLORADO

The absurdity of the suffragist claim that giving the ballot to women ensures better legislation in general, and better laws in particular for the protection of women and children can in no way be more clearly demonstrated than by a comparison of the statutes of suffrage and non-suffrage states.

Of the suffrage states, it is fairest to select Colorado for such a comparison; for, of the states in which woman suffrage has been tested long enough to yield any results, Colorado has the largest population and presents conditions more nearly like those which prevail in the middle and eastern states.

Comparing the laws of Massachusetts with those of Colorado, we find some things in common. In both states, there are juvenile courts and parental schools; in both, there is generous legislation for the care of dependent children, with women members of the boards in charge; in both, fathers and mothers are joint heirs of a child; and in both it is a criminal offence to contribute to the delinquency of a child. In Colorado, the age of consent for girls is 18; in Massachusetts it is 16. To the credit of Colorado is to be placed a wise law forbidding the insuring of the lives of children under fifteen years of age, which does not exist in Massachusetts. Colorado has a law forbidding the employment of children under 14 in smelter, etc.; but Massachusetts goes much farther. In this state, it is forbidden to employ children under 14 in a factory, workshop or mercantile establishment; the public exhibition of children under 15 is not allowed; and children under 18 are not allowed in places injurious to the health of minors. Railroad companies are forbidden to allow children under 10 years of age, selling papers, to enter their cars.

Here is a brief list of laws in force in Massachusetts for the protection of women and children which Colorado,—where women have had the

ballot for twenty years—has neglected to enact:

1. The property of a wife who files a certificate of business on her separate account cannot be attached as the property of her husband.

2. With respect to necessities, a man is liable for the debts of his wife; but a married woman is not liable for the debts of her husband, except to the amount of \$100.

3. A wife or child has the right of action for damages for the sale or gift of liquor to husband or father.

4. Women cannot be arrested in civil action except for torts.

5. Women are forbidden to be employed between 10 o'clock at night and 6 o'clock in the morning.

6. The meal hours of women and children employed in factories are regulated.

7. There is a penalty of \$100 for selling liquor to a child under 18.

8. The employment of children under 18 in barrooms is forbidden.

This list of humane laws in the interest of women and children, in force in Massachusetts but non-existent in Colorado, might be considerably lengthened by other citations, if it were worth while; but the foregoing is sufficient to prove that it is not Massachusetts which should catch up with Colorado in such legislation, but Colorado which should catch up with Massachusetts.

PREPARING THE WORLD FOR THE CHILDREN

(Harold Owen in "Woman Adrift")

"We have to prepare the children for the world; we want to prepare the world for the children." It sounds well; it has a nice antithetical balance, and all the seduction of rhetoric. But if we change the terms whilst preserving the antithetical balance, we shall see how much reason it expresses. "We have to prepare clothes for the man; we want to prepare man for the clothes." If a tailor said that, we should know

that he was talking nonsense. For, without any reflection, we should instantly perceive that the two functions were, not necessarily opposed, but entirely different. But because we do not so instantly realize what preparing the children for the world means, and what preparing the world for the children involves, the incongruity is not so apparent. And uttered, as it was, on a platform, it no doubt sounded irrefutable, and no doubt the audience applauded it warmly. But if a cook told her mistress, "I have to prepare the dinner for the table—I cannot be expected to prepare the table for the dinner," we should think she was an extremely reasonable cook indeed.

And I dwell on that sentence of nicely balanced antithesis not merely to show how delusive a thing Suffragist rhetoric may be, but because the speaker could not have better framed a sentence that contained the material for the whole practical and simple philosophy of this big matter. We cannot better delimit the spheres of man and woman than by saying it is the work of man to prepare the world for children and the work of woman to prepare the children for the world. But so flexible and mutual and reciprocal are the relations of man and woman that the work of each helps the other, so that even in preparing the children for the world—which is no small matter, being perhaps more than half the battle—a mother is also helping to prepare the world for the children. For by every son she sends out into the world, equipped with those virtues which her maternal care has grafted upon his budding manhood, she is helping to prepare the world for the children of her children. And if it were possible for the human species to have fashioned themselves with a divine insight as well as with the knowledge gained from human experience, they could not have hit upon a more harmonious dualism than the Creator created in Man and Woman.

"CATCHING UP WITH CHINA"

For months past, suffragist orators and newspaper writers have been holding up to the United States the example of China in the treatment of women. China, it has been asserted over and over, has admitted women to political rights, and Chinese women are taking a part in legislation. "Catch up with China" is the motto which has been borne upon suffrage banners.

Outside of the suffragists, no one has known of any Chinese parliament or recognized provincial assembly to which women had been elected or in which they were sitting as members. But the suffragists have been so confident in their assertions that many people have accepted them as true.

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, President of the International Woman's Alliance, has recently returned from a tour of investigation in China; and she communicates the results in a letter in *The Woman's Journal* for October 5th. At Hong Kong, she could find no one, Chinese, American or European, who knew anything about women legislators. She was told that there was no other foundation for the astonishing statements which had gone forth to the world concerning the relation of Chinese women to the Revolution and the Republic than a slight agitation of such indefinite character that no details of it were known. At Canton, she pursued her inquiries for two days before she found any one who could enlighten her.

What she ascertained is, in substance this: that there was organized at Canton some years ago a secret society called the Tung Mong Hui; that, when the Manchu regime was overthrown, the leaders of this society arranged for the election of an Assembly for that province; that "practically all men and women who chose to do so were allowed to vote for this Assembly; that it was ordered by those in authority that ten women should be elected;" that

"in reality few took interest or cognizance of the proceedings except the members of the Tung Mong Hui;" and that ten women were chosen accordingly, and Mrs. Catt saw them in the Assembly with the men.

But how slight a foundation these proceedings of a secret society at Canton afford for the often-repeated assertions that China has admitted women to the suffrage and to parliament, is shown by the following candid admission by Mrs. Catt:

"The leaders of the Tung Mong Hui believe that women voted for the provisional Assembly in no other province, and that there are no women members in any other Assembly, nor in the National Council. Woman suffrage was not granted by the provisional constitutional convention, so only men will vote at the coming elections."

In view of all this, the exhortation to "Catch up with China" is rather amusing.

A SUFFRAGETTE SPLIT IN ENGLAND

Mr. and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence, who were tried and convicted with Mrs. Pankhurst for their share in the conspiracy of promiscuous window-smashing, have had enough of that particular mode of campaigning, and have parted finally with Mrs. Pankhurst.

The Lawrences will continue the publication of "Votes for Women,"—hitherto the organ of the militant suffragists; and the Women's Social and Political Union,—Mrs. Pankhurst's organization—has established a new organ "The Suffragette." This is edited by Miss Christabel Pankhurst. Her work will be done at arm's length, however, for her distaste for martyrdom continues to keep her out of England.

This split is highly significant. It shows that the senseless attacks upon private property, which alienated public sympathy in England, and admittedly changed 25 votes in Parliament, have reacted within the inner suffragette circles.

SUFFRAGE AND THE BIBLE
Written When Women Were Chattels,
Says Votes Advocate.

(From *The New York Evening Post*,
Dec. 9, 1912)

CHICAGO, December 9.—"A woman cannot be a conscientious Christian and a suffragist also, because of man's monopoly of the Bible and religion," said Mrs. Laura G. Fixen, business manager of the Working Woman's Home, addressing the Woman's Party meeting last night. "We cannot accept the Bible as a divine inspiration, because it features the male sex in everything, almost to the exclusion of the female," she continued. "Man has usurped almost everything in religion, as well as everything else."

"In the Bible that we know, God is represented as a man, Christ as a man, the Apostles as men, and the angels in heaven as men, and in it women are commanded to obey their husbands. Suffragists cannot accept the Bible literally as a Divine inspiration. We must see that it was written by men at a time when women were their chattels. The position given women in the Bible has kept them from their rights as the equals of men. The Bible needs revision. It is not up to date."

A CHANCE TO TEST IT

(Caroline M. Parker in the *Boston Herald*,
Nov. 13, 1912)

The suffragists have a splendid opportunity to prove in these new states, that woman suffrage will accomplish what they claim for it—namely, pure food, pure water, prevention of infectious diseases, healthy cities, clean streets, better schools, better morals, better regulation of labor and taxation, better laws for women and children, an incorruptible government, and the abolition of poverty! If, at the end of 20 years, they have accomplished even half these things, we shall all undoubtedly become suffragists. If, on the other hand, as in Colorado, where they have had woman suffrage nearly 20 years, vice continues to flourish unchecked, juvenile crime and divorce are frightfully on the increase, and the women politicians are quite as corrupt as the men, I see no reason why we should follow their expensive and futile example. It is by fulfilling their glittering promises in the suffrage states that the suffragists will bring about woman suffrage here, and not by trying to force it upon an unwilling majority.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

THE NEW JERSEY Anti-Suffrage Society is extending its organization to every county in the state, and has appointed a chairman and a committee in each county, to push the work of enrolment.

LOUISIANA VOTERS rejected by a decisive vote the proposed constitutional amendment permitting women to hold educational or charitable offices. This is a fresh indication that the suffrage agitation has not made the slightest impression upon public sentiment in the southern states.

A BRANCH of the Rhode Island Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been formed at Newport. The officers are: President, Mrs. Charles Weaver; Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe; Treasurer, Mrs. H. E. Yarnell. The membership is already large.

THE CONNECTICUT Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, organized only a year ago, is growing rapidly, and has now an enrolment of more than 1,300 members. It has branches in New Haven, New Canaan, Fairfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Bristol, Winsted, Danbury, Simsbury, Guilford, Old Lyme and Berlin.

IT WOULD be hard to imagine anything sillier or meaner than the conduct of the English suffragettes in pouring acids into the mail boxes, ringing in false fire alarms and endangering human life by tampering with railway signals. There could scarcely be anything better adapted to make enemies for the suffrage cause.

MARY SWAIN WAGNER, founder of the Political Equality League of Wisconsin, seeking an explanation of the overwhelming suffrage defeat in that state, gives a prominent place to the "appalling indifference" of the women; and says "When the women themselves showed so little eagerness to obtain the ballot, it is not surprising that many men who really believed in equal suffrage, decided it was best for the women to wait awhile."

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

IN 1910

In Oregon, a proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated by a majority of 23,795; in Oklahoma, a proposed suffrage amendment was defeated by a majority of 40,120; in South Dakota, a proposed suffrage amendment was defeated by a vote of 35,290 in favor to 57,709 opposed; in Kentucky a school suffrage bill was defeated in the legislature; in Maryland a state-wide suffrage bill was defeated, and a bill to confer municipal suffrage upon the women of Baltimore was indefinitely postponed in the House of Delegates by a vote of 67 to 24; in Massachusetts, a proposed constitutional amendment was adversely reported, 7 to 4, and defeated in the House by a vote of 155 to 54, and in the Senate without a division; in New York, the Assembly, by a vote of 87 to 46, and the Senate, by a vote of 30 to 16, refused to discharge the Judiciary Committee from consideration of a proposed suffrage amendment, so that the question might be brought to a vote; in Rhode Island, an adverse report upon a presidential suffrage bill was accepted by the Senate by a vote of 33 to 3; in Vermont, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated.

IN 1911

In Connecticut, the Senate passed a municipal suffrage bill, but the House rejected it by a vote of 168 to 49; in Illinois, the House voted, 71 to 68, not to suspend the rules to consider a local option suffrage bill which had been passed by the Senate; in Indiana, and in New Hampshire municipal suffrage bills were defeated; in Iowa, the legislature defeated a resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment; in Maine, Michigan and Montana, similar resolutions were defeated in the legislatures; in Massachusetts, a resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment was defeated in the House by a vote of 69 yeas to 161 nays, and in the Senate by a vote of 6 yeas to 31 nays. Bills to extend municipal suffrage to tax-paying women and to allow women in towns to vote upon questions involving the expenditure of money were adversely reported, 11 to 0, and the reports were accepted in both houses without debate; in Missouri, a bill to make women eligible as school directors was defeated; in New York, both houses refused to advance a resolution providing for the submission of a suffrage amendment; in South Dakota, the House refused to submit a proposed constitutional amendment to give full suffrage to women tax-payers; in Vermont, the House, by a vote of 97 yeas to 126 nays, defeated a bill to give women the right to vote at local option elections.

IN 1912

In Maryland, February 29th, the House, by a vote of 74 to 18, rejected a bill which provided for state-wide woman suffrage through a constitutional amendment.

In New Jersey, March 19th, a resolution to submit a suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated in the Senate, by a vote of 17 to 3.

In New York, in the Senate, a motion to strike out the enacting clause of a bill to submit a suffrage amendment was carried in committee of the whole, 24 to 17; a motion to disagree with this action failed by a vote of 19 yeas to 21 nays; and in the Assembly, a motion to disagree with the adverse vote of the Judiciary Committee fell 8 votes short of the 76 needed to pass it.

In Massachusetts, a proposed constitutional amendment giving full suffrage to women, which had been adversely reported without a dissenting vote, was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 17 yeas to 20 nays, including pairs; and in the House by a vote of 96 yeas to 116 nays, including pairs.

In New Hampshire, June 20th, the Constitutional Convention, by a roll call vote of 208 to 149 rejected a proposed amendment to the constitution giving full suffrage to women. The amendment had been adversely reported by the committee to which it was referred by a vote of 9 to 7.

In Ohio, September 3, a proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated at the polls by a majority of 87,455. Only 19 out of 88 counties voted for it.

In Louisiana, November 5, a constitutional amendment to allow women to hold educational and charitable offices was defeated at the polls.

In Wisconsin, November 5, a proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution was defeated at the polls by a vote of 135,545 to 227,024.

In Michigan, a proposed suffrage amendment to the Constitution, for which a majority of 5,000 was claimed by the suffragists on the early returns, was shown by the official returns to have been defeated by a majority of 760.

THE REMONSTRANCE welcomes the organization of the Vermont Society Opposed to Woman Suffrage. The officers are: President, Mrs. Brookes Brown; Vice President, Mrs. George W. Wales; Secretary, Mrs. Mathew H. Buckham; Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan; Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrell, Mrs. Clarence L. Smith; Chairman of Membership Committee, Miss Pattie H. Linsley. There are now anti-suffrage organizations in all the New England states.

ONE of the measures submitted to the voters of Colorado at the November election was the "mothers' compensation law,"—a measure intended to extend aid to poor and helpless mothers. It might have been assumed that such a proposal would have especially appealed to the women voters, but Alice Rohe, a suffragist, reporting for the Denver News, affirms the contrary. She says: "Beautifully-gowned women in their own electrics, handsomely gowned

young women surrounded in their homes by all the luxuries and comforts that money could buy were openly working against the Act which is to provide for the protection of the home—which is to save the child and the mother through their mutual care and interest and love."

THE NOTION that woman suffrage means "a moral uplift" in politics is dealt rather a severe blow by the disclosures of municipal corruption in Denver. As a result of investigations of vice and the saloons, the food trust, city hall graft and newspaper blackmailing, the grand jury at Denver returned forty-six indictments last September against the former mayor and chief of police, four present and former members of the Fire and Police Board, five members of the School Board, including one woman, and about one hundred corporations and individuals. And this in a city where women at the polls had been exerting their "moral uplift" for nineteen years.